

From: "Buckrucker, Elizabeth A NWK"
To: Tom Taccone/R2/USEPA/US@EPA; Elizabeth Butler/R2/USEPA/US@EPA; lizabeth Butler/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: FW: Passaic Cost Invoice #34 -
Date: Wednesday, May 17, 2006 11:03:00 AM
Attachments: [Invoice 34 comments.pdf](#)

FYI -- don't think I'd sent this before - thinking I would handle with MPI without clogging your emails with details. But we might want to touch on this tomorrow - it does fall into the performance issue and it was one of Ken's concerns. I did note to him I preferred we handle it without having to take your time but I did want you to be informed of some of the funding issues that are not yet resolved. I had even preferred to handle at Len's level but he elevated it to Ken.

They owe me a response to these things which I have not yet received.

Beth Buckrucker

Senior Project Manager, CENWK-PM-ES

Ph: (816) 389-3581 ** NOTE -- NEW prefix on phone number

F: (816) 389-2023

C: (816) 695-5797

-----Original Message-----

From: Buckrucker, Elizabeth A NWK

Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2006 10:43 AM

To: Len Warner (E-mail); 'Scott Thompson (E-mail)'

Subject: Passaic Cost Invoice #34 -

Gentlemen,

I'm withholding some payment from Invoice #34; below details a summary of this;

WAD4/WO1 \$17,589 This includes all MPI labor plus indirects.

WAD5/WO2 \$ 4,867 This is cost overrun per BSF; I'll hold until resolved before invoice submitted.

WAD 5/WO 3 \$ 1,238 This is the amount this line item exceeds the BSF

Fee \$10,000 Not quite half of the fee is being held until above issues resolved.

Total \$33,694

Note that from PR #33, \$ 4,562 still held waiting on technical support justification.

Specific Notes:

1. The WAD4 charges are being held until Len can confirm that they are all applicable to the particular task being charged. Following a visit by Len/Ken to KC (Dec 05), I detailed my expectations that the WAD4/WO1 charges would not exceed the authorized budget; and received committed to endeavor to maintain the budget. We added funds specifically to support the period Jan - Mar 06 and employed cost saving measures such as less progress call etc to ensure we could make this. See attached email w/ this history.

Now, BSF #39 shows WAD4/WO1 will be overbudget by several thousand dollars yet no mention is made within the PR of why this occurred nor what is being done to correct the situation to bring project in on budget.

For example, WAD4/WO1 projects pure cost overrun of \$55k with note "Funding needs to include prep for April PDT presentation". This sentence is not clear.

Does the \$55k include this prep?

How much is the prep?

What is reason for balance of cost overrun?

Just to restate my expectation - I expect the budget on WAD4/WO1 to be within \$1,419,177. Or to know exactly why not and approve of such.

2. WAD5/WO3.3 -- Field Investigation Expenses. Funding was added via WVN 11 after carefully determining how much would be needed to keep the facility "running" until end of March 2006. This is also projected to be overbudget it appears -- the comment "Not all March charges hit BSF" is not clear -- will this task be on budget as of end of March or not? I see no specific charges on this invoice - but do not intend to disburse funds beyond the authorized amount until we have resolved the situation.

My perception now is that 3.3a will be almost \$8k over budget - this is not acceptable if it's the case.

3. WAD5/WE2.2b - CSM "Tech memo review required add'l effort" for comment. The PR states "additional budget... is required... will be conducted under new USACE contract"; sounding as if the extra effort won't be charged to TO 11. Yet the BSF shows JTD expenses already exceeding budget - which is it? I'm holding the funds until this is resolved; I cannot confirm how much more sub cost will be invoiced. Is more effort required under new contract as well? This is just unclear enough - that I'm withholding what BSF shows as cost overrun. Even though invoice is not over for WO2; I am concerned this is headed for a cost overrun.

I would like for all cost overruns to be discussed in future PRs, along with why and what is the action to be taken. Please do not assume I'm going to do this analysis and just add funds.

I apologize if I forget these details as they may come up in during conversation - but please don't assume I'll recall everything nor understand short phrases. In future PRs/BSFs - please take this into consideration. I'm sorry if I'm being difficult on this issue of payment - but I must understand what the gov't is paying for before I approve.

Len and I spoke at length yesterday about WAD4 - I'm sure he'll share these thoughts. I would like to resolve these without VP, hence did not copy Ken -- since I see he already had a fair share of time charged. But if you need to copy and involve him, please keep this in mind when it comes time to charge management hours - should not be a reason to have an overrun. I would hope in the "reality" check at MPI before submitting - these things are caught in review - unless I'm the only one who doesn't understand --

Regards,

Beth Buckrucker

Senior Project Manager, CENWK-PM-ES

Ph: (816) 389-3581 ** NOTE -- NEW prefix on phone number

F: (816) 389-2023

C: (816) 695-5797

<<RE: BSF 38 - WAD 4/WO 1 Tasks Budget>> <<Invoice 34 comments.pdf>>

Received: from eis-ml1itl.eis.ds.usace.army.mil ([140.194.245.33]) by nwk-ml1kcd46247.nwk.ds.usace.army.mil with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.1830) ; Wed, 22 Feb 2006 09:50:38 -0600

Received: from eis-ml2itl.eis.ds.usace.army.mil ([140.194.245.34]) by eis-ml1itl.eis.ds.usace.army.mil with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.1830) ; Wed, 22 Feb 2006 09:50:31 -0600

Received: from gw2.usace.army.mil ([140.194.100.150]) by eis-ml2itl.eis.ds.usace.army.mil with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.1830) ; Wed, 22 Feb 2006 09:45:26 -0600

Received: from webaccess03.pirnie.com ([12.170.10.124]) by gw2.usace.army.mil with ESMTP; 22 Feb 2006 15:45:25 +0000

Received: from whimail04.malcolmpirnie.com ([10.150.1.7]) by webaccess03.pirnie.com with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.0); Wed, 22 Feb 2006 10:45:25 -0500

Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 10:45:27 -0500

From: "Warner, Len" <LWarner@PIRNIE.COM>

Subject: RE: BSF 38 - WAD 4/WO 1 Tasks Budget

To: "Buckrucker, Elizabeth A NWK" <Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker@nwk02.usace.army.mil>, "Thompson, Scott \White Plains\" <SThompson@PIRNIE.COM>

Cc: "Goldstein, Kenneth J." <KGoldstein@PIRNIE.COM>

Message-id: <887BA0472ABF144690159D13A2D32CE68B7295@whimail04.malcolmpirnie.com>

Content-type: multipart/alternative; boundary="Boundary_(ID_aQKuApnnz70v3HfrOYpGVg)"

MIME-version: 1.0

X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.5

Thread-Topic: BSF 38 - WAD 4/WO 1 Tasks Budget

Thread-Index: AcY3uYLJEo7LwWc6QxWtBYO/LhxKWgADFnPQ

Content-class: urn:content-classes:message

X-MS-Has-Attach:

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

Hi Beth:

Understood. We will endeavor to maintain the WAD 04 WO 01 charges within the remaining \$18K or so in the authorized budget. We will still deliver a BSF for March 2006 as discussed previously. I may shift some funding (modifying the forecast on the current BSF of \$15K in WE 1.1 Project Management) to facilitate important project communications, such as that requested by Alice for the Step 2 geochemical evaluation.

Regarding your voice mail about PRP data uploads, I assume that on both projects (Passaic and Newark Bay) there will be no further field application programming (for example, for biota collection), just development of data upload modules so that the PRPs can access PREmis/NBmis to enter their collected data. Should we be asked to conduct a one-time FSP Volume 2 field data collection event in 2006 to help maintain schedule objectives, we would examine the full range of alternatives available to us to economically enter the data to PREmis. Let me know if that doesn't answer your question.

Len

From: Buckrucker, Elizabeth A NWK [<mailto:Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker@nwk02.usace.army.mil>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 9:09 AM

To: Warner, Len; Thompson, Scott (White Plains)

Subject: BSF 38 - WAD 4/WO 1 Tasks Budget

Greetings,

Just wanted to confirm that the charges on WAD 4, WO 1 will NOT exceed the authorized budget of \$1,419,177. We had put \$85k into these WO 1 management tasks with the agreement we'd have management support thru the March PR reporting (at least a BSF). And I think we agreed we'd cut to monthly conference call (the last of which was 24 Jan 06). The current BSF continues to show being overbudget on this with tasks continuing to run over the projections. Just want to be on record of not concurring to being overbudget on these tasks but maybe I've not been clear. I see anything overbudget here as cost overrun and is not fee bearing. Cost projections have been increased over the past few months and these still continue to be exceeded; would prefer better cost control even if it means taking folks off the project or whatever solution is preferred.

Please call me if you'd like to discuss.

Regards,

Beth Buckrucker

Senior Project Manager, CENWK-PM-ES

Ph: (816) 983-3581

F: (816) 426-5509

C: (816) 695-5797